

New identifications among the sixth-century fragments of Augustine in Cambridge University library

Houghton, H.A.G.

DOI:
[10.1484/J.SE.5.119450](https://doi.org/10.1484/J.SE.5.119450)

License:
Creative Commons: Attribution-NonCommercial (CC BY-NC)

Document Version
Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Citation for published version (Harvard):
Houghton, HAG 2020, 'New identifications among the sixth-century fragments of Augustine in Cambridge University library', *Sacris Erudiri*, vol. 59, pp. 171-180. <https://doi.org/10.1484/J.SE.5.119450>

[Link to publication on Research at Birmingham portal](#)

General rights

Unless a licence is specified above, all rights (including copyright and moral rights) in this document are retained by the authors and/or the copyright holders. The express permission of the copyright holder must be obtained for any use of this material other than for purposes permitted by law.

- Users may freely distribute the URL that is used to identify this publication.
- Users may download and/or print one copy of the publication from the University of Birmingham research portal for the purpose of private study or non-commercial research.
- User may use extracts from the document in line with the concept of 'fair dealing' under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 (?)
- Users may not further distribute the material nor use it for the purposes of commercial gain.

Where a licence is displayed above, please note the terms and conditions of the licence govern your use of this document.

When citing, please reference the published version.

Take down policy

While the University of Birmingham exercises care and attention in making items available there are rare occasions when an item has been uploaded in error or has been deemed to be commercially or otherwise sensitive.

If you believe that this is the case for this document, please contact UBIRA@lists.bham.ac.uk providing details and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate.

New Identifications Among the Sixth-Century Fragments of Augustine in Cambridge University Library*

H. A. G. HOUGHTON

(*Birmingham*)

Although almost all manuscripts of the works of Saint Augustine date from a much later period, there are over thirty fragments (and a few complete codices) from the sixth century or earlier which attest to the popularity of his writings in antiquity. The “Cambridge Fragments” have been known since 1916, when details of the three largest pieces were published by Francis Crawford Burkitt.¹ These were found in the Cairo Genizah at the end of the nineteenth century and acquired by Cambridge University Library in 1899. The Augustine texts, written on parchment in a fine Italian uncial hand of the sixth century, had been palimpsested in the ninth or tenth century with a set of Hebrew masoretic lists on books including Joshua, 1 Samuel and Isaiah.² Pages of the original manuscript were simply folded in half to create the new document and some of the undertext remains relatively legible to the naked eye, although it is often obscured by the overwriting and there is extensive decay to the parchment. The original Augustine manuscript was a luxury production, written in a single column of thirty lines with wide outer margins, its pages measuring at least thirty centimetres tall by twenty centimetres broad: a sense of the overall layout is provided by the image in Plate 1. Apart from the standard *nomina sacra* and the use of a supralinear stroke at the end of lines for final *n* or *m*

* This paper was prepared as part of the CATENA project, which has received funding from the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union Horizon 2020 Research and Innovation Programme (grant agreement no. 770816), in conjunction with the PLATINUM project led by Maria Chiara SCAPPATICCIO funded under the same scheme (grant agreement no. 636983). The author would like to thank Ben OUTHWAITE, Head of the Genizah Unit at Cambridge University Library, for providing images and bibliographical details, and Christina M. KREINECKER for her comments on the transcription.

¹ F. C. BURKITT, “Augustine-Fragments from the Cairo Genizah”, *Journal of Theological Studies*, os 17 (1916), pp. 137-138.

² See S. C. REIF, *Hebrew Manuscripts at Cambridge University Library: A Description and Introduction*. University of Cambridge Oriental Publications 52. Cambridge, 1997, p. 299.

(indicated by an additional dot), there are no abbreviations. No evidence survives of paragraphing, pagination, or the distinguishing of biblical quotations (*lemmata*).

Burkitt identified the three largest pages (CAMBRIDGE, University Library, MS Add. 4320 a–c) as containing portions of the latter part of Book 2 of *De sermone domini in monte*, including the end of the work with an *explicit* written in double-height capitals. This was followed by a three-line *incipit* probably written in rubrics, which was not legible to Burkitt, and the opening paragraphs of *Sermo* 118 (see Plate 1). Burkitt's transcription was very partial, and for her *Corpus Christianorum* edition of *De sermone domini* published in 1967, Almut Mutzenbecher relied on a photocopy of these pages to establish the text of this witness, to which she gave the siglum G.³ Perhaps unsurprisingly, given its age, the manuscript proves to be an excellent source: apart from a handful of common orthographic variants not mentioned by Mutzenbecher and an omission through *homoeoteleuton* (line 1941), there are only three places where it has a reading which differs from her editorial text (*alias* for *illas*, *considerandum* for *considerandus* and *audimus* for *audiuimus*, all between lines 2010–2012). Both Robert Cavenaile (CPL 55) and Joseph van Haelst (no. 1209) rely on Burkitt for their description of the manuscript, although Elias Avery Lowe's account of the hand (CLA II 136) indicates that he had examined it in person.⁴

Nevertheless, there is more to this manuscript than the pages so far described. MS Add. 4320 actually consists of no fewer than fifty-two parchment fragments: the first three leaves, which have portions of all four margins extant, are each mounted between their own set of glass plates, while all the fragments numbered 4–52 are mounted in a fourth set of plates (MS Add. 4320d). Fragments 4 and 5 are both about the size of a quarter of an original page, with a margin on one side; fragments 6–10 contain six letters at most; the remaining fragments, arranged in descending order of size, are barely large enough for two letters. Burkitt did not identify the text on fragments 4 and 5, and Mutzenbecher did not proceed beyond establishing that it was not part of *De sermone domini*.⁵ What is more, as part of the cataloguing of the additional series of manuscripts in the Taylor-Schechter collection from the Cairo Genizah, also held by Cam-

³ Aurelius Augustinus, *De Sermone Domini in Monte*, ed. A. MUTZENBECHER, Turnhout 1967 (CCSL, 35).

⁴ R. CAVENAILE, *Corpus Papyrorum Latinarum*, Wiesbaden, 1958, pp. 133–134; J. VAN HÆLST, *Catalogue des papyrus littéraires juifs et chrétiens*, Paris, 1976, pp. 365–366; E. A. LOWE, *Codices Latini Antiquiores. II. Great Britain and Ireland*, Oxford, 1935 (no. 136). Van Haelst gives the date of the manuscript as the fourth century, but this must be a typographical error of *iv* for *vi*.

⁵ MUTZENBECHER, *De sermone domini*, p. xxi n. 2.

bridge University Library, a further fragment of this manuscript was identified during the 1990s (CAMBRIDGE, University Library, T-S AS 139.1). Although this is mentioned with the other fragments of the original manuscript in Reif's catalogue, the first recorded identification of its undertext – as a further portion of *De sermone domini* – was by Ben Outhwaite in a posting on the Cambridge University Library website in May 2007 including images of the fragment.⁶

In conjunction with the preparation of a new “Corpus of Latin Texts on Papyrus” by the European Research Council-funded PLATINUM project (led by Maria Chiara Scappaticcio at the University of Naples), the present author examined colour digital images of all the surviving fragments of this manuscript. A full transcription – the first, in fact, of every page of the manuscript apart from Burkitt's transcription of MS Add. 4320b recto – will be published as part of that corpus. This examination, however, has resulted in the identification of the two fragments in MS Add. 4320d which contain substantial text. In each case, they constitute the earliest surviving witness to that writing by several centuries. Furthermore, despite the paucity of remaining pages, these fragments provide a new understanding of the contents of the original codex.

Fragment 4, the biggest piece on MS Add. 4320d (illustrated in Plate 2), contains on both sides text from the first two paragraphs of Augustine, *Sermo* 225 auct. The majority of manuscripts transmit this sermon delivered on Easter Sunday in a heavily abbreviated version. It was only in 2015 that Clemens Weidmann published a full text of this sermon for the first time, based on the longer version extant in two twelfth-century witnesses.⁷ Given that the clearest phrases on this fragment constitute part of this additional material, secure identification of this fragment would have been impossible before the publication of this edition. As it is, we now have a witness to the longer version which is some six hundred years older than the other two manuscripts. Although this fragment is small, both the extant letters and the illegible or lacunose spaces correspond closely to the text printed by Weidmann. There are two variants, both on the side currently presented as the *verso* on the glass plates even though its text precedes that of the *recto* on which the fragments are numbered. The first line begins *GOIPSE..CI*/. This text does not correspond to the phrase *quidquid*

⁶ REIF, *Hebrew Manuscripts*, p. 299; B. OUTHWAITE, “St Augustine in the Genizah: Fragment of the Month (May 2007)”: <<https://www.lib.cam.ac.uk/collections/departments/taylor-schechter-genizah-research-unit/fragment-month/fragment-month-20-23>> (last visited 12.8.2019).

⁷ Aurelius Augustinus, *Sermones Selecti*, ed. C. WEIDMANN, Berlin & New York, 2015 (CSEL, 101).

factum est a deo per ipsum factum est, which immediately precedes *an numquid ipse se fecit* in both the longer and shorter traditions of this sermon (§ 1, line 23). It may be that, before the following sequence of three questions, Augustine made a statement of position based on John 1:3, such as *ergo ipse se fecit*, which he then problematised. There are clear parallels for this on either side, such as *ergo erat* (§ 1, line 8) and *ergo tale opus fecit* (§ 2, line 5).⁸ The omission of such a short interjection through eyeskip to *ipse se fecit* in the next phrase is a straightforward error which could have happened at an early point in the tradition. The second variant is partly supported by the manuscripts of the shorter version: instead of reading *si ergo qui se faceret erat* in the following line, the palimpsest appears to support *si ergo erat qui se faceret*, repeating the word order of the previous phrase. There is no other point at which this witness appears to depart from Weidmann's editorial text: it clearly supports the reading *postremo* (§ 1, line 24) despite the conjecture of *putamus* in place of this word which Weidmann offers in the apparatus. Unfortunately the end of *sedent[is]* (§ 2, line 5) is missing, so it cannot be determined whether the fragment read *sedentem* with the other manuscripts or supports the genitive in Pseudo-Augustine, *Sermo* Mai 76. The full transcription is as follows:

Frag. 4 'verso' undertext: Sermo 225 auct. 1 (line 23) to 2 (line 5)

- go ipse [fe]ci[t an numquid ipse]
 se fecit post[emo si se ipse fecit]
 3 erat [q]ui se facer[et si ergo erat qui]
 se f[acer]et numq[uam non erat quomo]- 2.
 do ergo in uirgine tal[e uerbum omnia]
 6 per ipsum facta sunt [et fit ipse fit ip]-
 se sed homo non a patr[e solo sed etiam]
 a se ipso quid est a se ips[o quia omnia]
 9 per ip[su]m fa[cta] sunt n[on]oli separare]
 ab isto t[anto] opere [SPM SCM a quo]
 tanto op[er]e a car[ne] [XPI non est par]-
 12 uum opu[s mag]num [DI opus sunt ange]-
 li carne[m XP]I · s[e]dent[is ad dexteram]
 [p]atris ado[r]ant et an[geli ergo tale opus]
 15 [fecit] et s[an]c[t]us ---]

Frag. 4 'recto' undertext: Sermo 225 auct. 2 (lines 12-19)

- [SPS SCS superueniet in te] ecce[e] quomodo
 [fiet quod quaeris et] uirg[ini]s alt[issim]i-
 3 [mi obumbrabit tibi] ipse sps s[an]c[t]us uir-
 [tus altissimi dictus est] et bene d[icitu]r op[er]e
 [umbrabit tibi n]e tua uirginitas ae[s]-

⁸ Compare also the treatment of this passage by Augustine in *Sermo* 118.1.

- 6 [tum libidinis s]entiat obumbrabit
[tibi propter] hoc quod nascētur ex
[te scm uocabit]ur fili[us] dī et cum
9 [praegnans e]sse[?] dīctū[m] est] dē illa
[inuenta est in ute]ro hab[ens] d[eu]m spu sco
[operatus est ergo sps] sc[ilicet] c[ar]ne[m] xpī
12 [operatus est et i]pse x[ristus] un[igenitus]
[filius dī carnem] suam u[nde] p[ro]ba-
[mus quia inde ai]t sc[ri]pt[ur]a sapie[n]-

Fragment 5 of MS Add. 4320d (illustrated in Plate 3) contains not a sermon but a portion of Augustine's treatise *Contra sermonem Arrianorum*. It is narrower than fragment 4 but slightly taller, preserving the beginning of fifteen lines from paragraph 18 on the *recto* and the corresponding ends of lines from a later part of the same paragraph on the *verso*. Despite the extensive lacunae, the text appears to agree fully with the editorial text of Pierre-Marie Hombert's recent *Corpus Christianorum* edition.⁹ The only unexpected feature is the gap between the end of *referunt* and *et* on line 15 of the *recto*. This is not a natural break in sense: even so, despite discoloration, damage and creasing, the parchment between these two words appears to be a blank space of two to three characters in width and Hombert reports no variants. The extensive lacunae mean that there is little overlap with any variation in the textual tradition of this work which would assist with further determining the affiliation of this witness, which is now the oldest known direct evidence for this work by at least two centuries. The full transcription is as follows:

Frag. 5 recto undertext: Contra sermonem Arrianorum 18 (lines 20-30)

- tri[us] [esse asserunt in quibus honorem et]
au[cto]r[itatem filii constituunt iudi]-
3 ca[us]a[rum] [officiosam uero aduocationem]
e[st] con[solatio]nem sps sci ad dignitatem]
iudicis hoc est dī [unigeniti pertinere]
6 tamquam iudicis sit d[ignitas] quod habe]-
at a[du]o[ca]t[um] s[ic]u[t] imperatoris est]
dignitas qu[o]d s[ecundum] suas imperiales le]-
9 ge[is] iu[dicaturu]m iu[dicem] mittit]
qua sū[a] cogitatione carnali tamen na]-
tur[ae] diuersitatem de qua inter nos et]
12 ip[s]os maxima quaestio est in his tribus]
pers[onis] demonstrare non possunt]
cū[m] enī[m] a[li]q[ui]d h[um]ano[s] mores ista re]-
15 [f]erunt et ab hū[mani] generis]

⁹ Aurelius Augustinus, *Contra Arrianos Opera*, ed. Pierre-Marie HOMBERT, Turnhout, 2009 (CCSL, 87A).

Frag. 5 verso undertext: Contra sermonem Arrianorum 18 (line 40) to 19 (line 2)

	[enim potest in rebus humanis ut] qui iu-	
	[dex fuerit etiam imperator fiat] hoc	
3	[isti in illa trinitate nec imperatoris]	
	[unico filio praestare di]gnantur[ur] q[uo]d	
	[si forte ex humani iuris] uel consuetudi-	
6	[nis formula maies]tatis crimen etiam	
	[in filio nimium reformi]dant aduocato	
	[certe puto quod concedere de]beant ut	
9	[ad iudiciariam po]tēst[atē] aliq[ui]uando	
	[perueniat ne hoc quidem uolunt de]te-	
	[rior ergo est quod absit in illa trini]tate	
12	[quam in generis humani mortalitate cond]i-	
	[tio porro scriptura sancta qua]e istos	19.
	[diuinos actus non differen]tia [p]rotesta-	
15	[tum sed operum ine]ffabilita[te] metit[ur]	

The additional leaf of *De sermone domini* identified by Outhwaite (T-S AS 139.1) supplements the readings of this manuscript already provided elsewhere in Mutzenbecher's edition. This fragment contains text from *De sermone domini* 2.24.80-81, with the *recto* extant for lines 1857-1863 (*lupos* to *inuentis*) and the *verso* for lines 1877-1882 (*faciant* to *quasdam*). It therefore originally came between MS Add. 4320c and 4320a. As with the other passages in this manuscript, the text here aligns with witnesses of the α -group rather than the β -group reflected in the premodern editions of this work: on the *recto* the extant letters support *ouium* rather than *ouibus* in line 1860 and *quod* rather than *quia* in line 1862; the reading *contegunt* and not *tegunt* in line 1861 is clear; the *verso* begins with the full text of the biblical lemma which is abbreviated in witnesses to the β -text. There are two variants from Mutzenbecher's editorial text. On line 10 of the *recto*, the six letters after *bus* do not correspond to the expected shapes for *inuentis*, and this word is followed by *in* rather than *cognoscamus*. It therefore seems likely that in this witness there was an additional word between *quibus* and *inuentis*. At line 1878, *quod* rather than *qua* is a simple error caused by the attraction of the relative to the following word (*gaudium*) rather than the more distant main noun (*proprietas*).¹⁰ *Quod* is found in ten of the thirteen manuscripts used by Mutzenbecher for this passage, including five of the six members of the α -group, and is therefore likely to have been early. The full transcription is as follows:

¹⁰ This is correctly identified by OUTHWAITE, "St Augustine in the Genizah".

T-S AS 139.1 *recto undertext: De serm. dom. 2.24.80-81* (lines 1857-1863)

[ouinos lupo]s ū[idere non possunt hi]
 [ergo non s]unt fr[uctus de qui]bu[s cogno]-
 3 [sci arbore]m monet ista enim cum [bono]
 [animo in] ueritate fiunt propriæ sunt
 [ouiu]m ues[t]e[s] cum autem malo in er[ro]-
 6 [re non] aliud quam lupos contegu[n]t
 s[ed non] ideo debent oues odisse [ues]-
 timentu[m] [suum] quod pl[eru]mq[ue] illo
 9 se occult[ant] lupi qui sunt ergo fructus qui]- **81.**
 busis in[---]
 [---]

T-S AS 139.1 *verso undertext: De serm. dom. 2.24.81* (lines 1877-1882)

[---]
 [---]
 3 [ut fa]cian[t] uobis homin[es haec et]
 [uos fa]cite illis ex ista proprie[ta]te
 uerbi q[uod] gaudium non dic[i]t[u]r nisi
 6 [in bonis] etiam propheta loquitur
 [no]n est gaudere imp[i]is dicit d[ns]
 [ita quo]d posit[a est] fides [non quae]-
 9 [cumque utique sed uera fides et ce]tera
 [quae hic posita sunt ha]ben[t] qu[a]sda[m]
 [---]

Producing a complete transcription of the other three leaves of *De sermone domini* leads to one correction to Mutzenbecher's edition, which may be of importance for her account of the early history of this work's transmission. In lines 1940-1942, the biblical lemma (Matthew 7:22) consists of three parallel clauses:

*nonne in nomine tuo prophetauimus,
 et in nomine tuo daemonia eiecimus,
 et in nomine tuo uirtutes multas fecimus?*

Scribal error due to eyeskip between the similar beginnings and ends of these clauses is clearly a possibility: according to Mutzenbecher, all witnesses to the β -group and the early editions omit the end of the first and beginning of the second clause (*prophetauimus* to *tuo*), as do manuscripts *G* (the Cambridge fragments) and *L*. However, closer inspection of MS Add. 4320a *recto* shows that this fragment definitely reads *prophetauimus* (probably with *f* for *ph*). Instead, the error made by this copyist was to omit the whole of the second clause (*et in nomine tuo daemonia eiecimus*), after which sufficient letters are extant to be sure that the third clause is there

in full. Unreported by any previous editor is a correction in the right hand margin of line 15: the word *nomine* in small uncial letters and a brown ink both similar to that of the first hand indicates that the omission was noticed and corrected, although the rest of the correction is illegible due to damage to the parchment. The wider importance of this correction is that it is one of two readings in which – according to Mutzenbecher – the Cambridge fragments agree with the β -group, allowing her to date that revision of the text to some time around the year 500.¹¹ The other reading is *alias* rather than *illas* in line 2010: although I have adopted this in my transcription, the first and third letters of this word are very unclear and I am not confident that there is sufficient space between what I take to be the initial *a* and the previous word (*ad*). If further examination of MS Add. 4320b, perhaps through multispectral imaging, were to confirm *illas* rather than *alias*, that would remove all connections between this manuscript and the witnesses of the β -group and might thereby prompt a reconsideration of the date of this revision.¹²

The identification of all the substantial surviving fragments of MS Add. 4320 permits a renewed appreciation of the original manuscript. Rather than simply bringing together *De sermone domini in monte* and *Sermo* 118, this document has now been shown to be a collection of a variety of Augustine's works including at least one further sermon and *Contra sermonem Arrianorum*. Such selections of multiple writings are paralleled among other early Augustine manuscripts: the famous fifth-century St Petersburg manuscript comprises *Ad Simplicianum*, *Contra epistolam Fundamenti* and *De agone christiano* as well as the first two books of *De doctrina christiana*, (ST PETERSBURG, National Library of Russia, lat. Q.v.I.3); a seventh-century Verona manuscript contains *De agone christiano*, *De fide* and Augustine's *Epistula ad Hieronymum* (VERONA, Biblioteca Capitolare 33 [31]); an extensive parchment and papyrus codex copied in France in the late seventh century contains a selection of Augustine's sermons and letters (PARIS, Bibliothèque nationale de France, lat. 11641; GENEVA, Bibliothèque de Genève MS Lat. 16 [97], ST PETERSBURG, National Library of Russia, lat. F.I.1). One may wonder whether such "omnibus editions" had any connection with the collected works of Augustine in the library at Hippo, whose contents were carefully documented by Possidius in his *Indiculum*. In the case of Augustine's sermons, the composition of early collections is of particular interest. Although Burkitt could not read the lengthy introduction before *Sermo* 118, the new images suggest that it begins *incipiunt sermones*,

¹¹ MUTZENBECHER, *De sermone domini*, pp. xxxi-xxxiv.

¹² Nevertheless, Mutzenbecher notes that Eugippius' assembly of extracts from Augustine, made at the turn of the sixth century, also appears to reflect readings characteristic of the β -group.

and the recovery of more text might shed light on the principles behind this selection: is it simply coincidence that both *Sermo* 118 and *Sermo* 225 were both preached following the liturgical reading of the opening verses of the Gospel according to John? Apart from the substantial collections of Augustine's sermons in the late Middle Ages, there does not appear to be any other example of these two homilies being transmitted together. Alternatively, the inclusion of *Contra sermonem Arrianorum* in this codex might indicate an anti-Arian theme which is also common to both these sermons.¹³

Finally, the subsequent travels of this manuscript raise intriguing questions too. How did a luxury codex of Augustine's writings come to be reused some three or four centuries later for writing Hebrew masoretic lists before being deposited in the genizah in Cairo? Might still more pages come to light from the same document? All its surviving portions offer the earliest evidence for each of the works now known to have been contained in this codex, which seems to have featured an unparalleled collection of Augustine's writings. These few fragments are valuable not only for their text but also for the light they shed on a fascinating document, whose survival hints at a rich and remarkable history.

Summary

This article offers a re-examination of the palimpsest fragments from a sixth-century codex of Augustine which were found in the Cairo Genizah and are now held in Cambridge University Library. The three largest fragments, with the shelfmark MS Add. 4320a–c, have already been identified as containing the end of *De sermone domini* and the beginning of *Sermo* 118. More recently, a smaller fragment of this manuscript was discovered in the Taylor-Schechter collection, also with text from *De sermone domini* (T-S AS 139.1). A full transcription of this fragment is published here for the first time. In addition, this article identifies the undertext on the two remaining substantial fragments of this manuscript (MS Add. 4320d). These contain part of *Sermo* 225 auct. and *Contra sermonem Arrianorum*, which means that they provide the oldest surviving witness to these works by several centuries. In addition to the *editio princeps* and images of these fragments, the article offers a small correction to Mutzenbecher's edition of *De sermone domini* and briefly considers the nature of the original codex as a compilation of multiple writings by Augustine.

H. A. G. HOUGHTON
ITSEE, University of Birmingham, UK
H.A.G.Houghton@bham.ac.uk

¹³ I am grateful to one of the anonymous reviewers of this article for this suggestion.



Plate 1. Cambridge, University Library, MS Add. 4320b (*recto*). This represents a typical page of the manuscript, showing the wide margins. It contains the end of *De sermone domini* with an *explicit* in double-height capitals, followed by a rubricated introduction and the beginning of *Sermo* 118. Reproduced by kind permission of the Syndics of Cambridge University Library.



Plate 2. Cambridge, University Library, MS Add. 4320d, fragment 4 (“verso” and “recto”), containing part of Augustine, *Sermo* 225 auct. 1-2. Reproduced by kind permission of the Syndics of Cambridge University Library.



Plate 3. Cambridge, University Library, MS Add. 4320d, fragment 5 (recto and verso), containing part of Augustine, *Contra sermonem Arrianorum* 18. Reproduced by kind permission of the Syndics of Cambridge University Library.